

United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

COURT MINUTES

HON. **William E. Duffin**, presiding.

Deputy Clerk: Mary

DATE: **August 26, 2016 at 10:00 AM**

Court Reporter: FTR Gold

CASE NO. **16-CR-21**

Time Called: 10:00:42

UNITED STATES v. **Samy Mohammed Hamzeh**

Time Concluded: 10:09:39

PROCEEDING: **Status/Scheduling Conference**

UNITED STATES by: **Paul L. Kanter**

DEFENDANT: **Samy Mohammed Hamzeh, in person and by**

ATTORNEY: **Craig W. Albee**

Court reviews the last hearing and the discovery status.

DEFENSE: Deft had received the disks and it is an ongoing process to review them with defendant.

- Received discovery disk from the government today. It contains summary translations of earlier conversations that appear to relate to disks of conversations that were previously provided to defense, but those were in Arabic. Will be going through those and speaking with the deft about translations received. These are summaries, not transcripts as we often might see and there will be a need for us to have transcripts of certain things and we are in the process of doing that.

- Ask for status conference in 6 weeks.

GOVT would like to clarify on the record. Government turned over today discovery disk marked 116. This includes summary translations of all of the other recorded conversations that the government has.

- There is classified information involved in this case and have been working through it. A vast majority of it the government has been able to deal with it through a declassification process. Govt will be filing an ex parte motion pursuant to the Classified Procedures Act.

GOVT has no objection to giving 6 weeks. Maybe 8 weeks would be prudent to build into it the filing and resolution of the CPA motion.

Status Conference set for October 28, 2016 at 11:00 AM

COURT makes a Speedy Trial finding. Under 18:U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(A)(ii) and (iv), court finds that a continuance of the speedy trial act deadline is appropriate because the ends of justice served by granting this continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Specifically, I find that given the complexity of the case, the nature of the prosecution, and the case taken as a whole that the failure to grant such a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant reasonable time for effective preparation. **Therefore, the time from today's date until October 28, 2016 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.**